



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,967	09/07/2000	Amy J. Snavely	END9-2000-0109 US1	2136
44755	7590	11/26/2004	EXAMINER	
SHELLEY M. BECKSTRAND 61 GLENMONT ROAD WOODLAWN, VA 24381			SMITH, PETER J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2176		

DATE MAILED: 11/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/656,967	SNAVELY, AMY J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-5,7,8,10-12 and 14-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-5,7,8,10-12 and 14-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 7/6/2004.
2. The rejection of claims 2, 6, 9, 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite has been withdrawn as a result of the cancellation of these claims.
3. The rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite has been withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment of the claim.
4. The rejection of claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment of the claims.
5. Claims 2, 6, 9, and 13 have been cancelled. Claims 17-20 have been added. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, and 14-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 16 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1, 3, 15, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd, US 6,460,041 B2 priority filed 04/26/2000 in view of Hills et al. (hereinafter “Hills”), US 6,239,797 B1 filed 4/2/1998 and Kanavy et al. (hereinafter “Kanavy”), US 5,544,298 patented 8/6/1996.**

Regarding independent claims 1, 15, and 16, Lloyd teaches writing page display hypertext markup language to a browser display in fig. 6-7, and col. 8 lines 20-47. Lloyd teaches

executing an agent to read data from a relational database table in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 56 – col. 3 line 22. Lloyd teaches dynamically populating the data to the page display in fig. 6-7, col. 2 line 56 – col. 3 line 22, and col. 12 lines 22-27. However, Lloyd does not teach executing a temporary frame in a first browser window to open a new window including the name of the agent, populating the new window with data, operating a new window to call the agent, and operating the agent to overwrite the temporary frame to dynamically populate the data to the page display.

Hills teaches executing a temporary frame, which Hills calls the scroll frame, to obtain data from a database to overwrite the temporary frame to dynamically populate the data to a page display in fig. 1-3, col. 1 lines 58-67, and col. 4 lines 34-54. Kanavy teaches opening a window to select and operate a specific agent to obtain desired data from a database in fig. 4 and col. 4 lines 31-40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hills and Kanavy into Lloyd to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the temporary data frame of Hills to have acquired the data from the database to have dynamically populated the page display so that the page display would have displayed the data without need for refresh as is taught by Hills in col. 2 lines 11-20. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the temporary window agent selection of Kanavy so that the user would have selected the desired data as is taught by Kanavy in col. 4 lines 37-40.

Regarding dependent claims 3 and 17, Lloyd teaches the use of conditional logic to control data queried from a database in col. 9 lines 6-17. Lloyd does not specifically teach that the conditional logic can control the look of the browser display to accommodate the various

types of data. Lloyd does teach that the conditional logic may contain other executable instructions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the conditional logic taught by Lloyd to have modified the browser display such that all the data contained in the database could have been accommodated in the web presentation.

8. Claims 8 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd, US 6,460,041 B2 priority filed 04/26/2000 in view of Hills et al. (hereinafter “Hills”), US 6,239,797 B1 filed 4/2/1998, Kanavy et al. (hereinafter “Kanavy”), US 5,544,298 patented 8/6/1996, and Lin et al. (hereinafter “Lin”), US 6,052,785 filed 11/21/1997.

Regarding independent claim 8, Lloyd teaches writing page display hypertext markup language to a browser display in fig. 6-7, and col. 8 lines 20-47. Lloyd teaches executing an agent to read data from a relational database table in fig. 7 and col. 2 line 56 – col. 3 line 22. Lloyd teaches dynamically populating the data to the page display in fig. 6-7, col. 2 line 56 – col. 3 line 22, and col. 12 lines 22-27. Lloyd does not teach a first database for storing code and tables implementing an application and a second database for storing data referenced by the application. Lloyd does not teach executing a temporary frame in a first browser window to open a new window including the name of the agent, populating the new window with data, operating a new window to call the agent, and operating the agent to overwrite the temporary frame to dynamically populate the data to the page display.

Lin does teach a first database for storing code and tables implementing an application in fig. 1, 3-5, and col. 2 lines 27-56. Lin does teach a second database for storing data referenced

by the application in fig. 1, 3-5, and col. 2 lines 27-56. Hills teaches executing a temporary frame, which Hills calls the scroll frame, to obtain data from a database to overwrite the temporary frame to dynamically populate the data to a page display in fig. 1-3, col. 1 lines 58-67, and col. 4 lines 34-54. Kanavy teaches opening a window to select and operate a specific agent to obtain desired data from a database in fig. 4 and col. 4 lines 31-40.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Lin, Hills, and Kanavy into Lloyd to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used a hybrid database environment to employ the respective strengths of each database type as is taught by Lin in col. 2 lines 27-56. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the temporary data frame of Hills to have acquired the data from the database to have dynamically populated the page display so that the page display would have displayed the data without need for refresh as is taught by Hills in col. 2 lines 11-20. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the temporary window agent selection of Kanavy so that the user would have selected the desired data as is taught by Kanavy in col. 4 lines 37-40.

Regarding dependent claims 10, Lloyd teaches the use of conditional logic to control data queried from a database in col. 9 lines 6-17. Lloyd does not specifically teach that the conditional logic can control the look of the browser display to accommodate the various types of data. Lloyd does teach that the conditional logic may contain other executable instructions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the conditional logic taught by Lloyd to have modified the browser display such that all the data contained in the database could have been accommodated in the web presentation.

Regarding dependent claims 11, Lloyd teaches varying access authority to the database to present in selected field so of the browser display straight text or text with hyperlinks in col. 2 lines 45-55 and col. 8 lines 48-59, and col. 35-64. Lloyd does not specifically teach the use of a role table to determine the access authority. Lin does teach the use of a role table to determine the access authority in fig. 3. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Lin into Lloyd to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the role table taught by Lin to implement the access authority for Lloyd so that the access authority could have been well organized and secure as taught by Lin in col. 7 lines 20-27.

9. Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd, US 6,460,041 B2 priority filed 04/26/2000 in view of Hills et al. (hereinafter “Hills”), US 6,239,797 B1 filed 4/2/1998 and Kanavy et al. (hereinafter “Kanavy”), US 5,544,298 patented 8/6/1996 as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Lin et al. (hereinafter “Lin”), US 6,052,785 filed 11/21/1997.

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 18, Lloyd teaches varying access authority to the database to present in selected field so of the browser display straight text or text with hyperlinks in col. 2 lines 45-55 and col. 8 lines 48-59, and col. 35-64. Lloyd does not specifically teach the use of a role table to determine the access authority. Lin does teach the use of a role table to determine the access authority in fig. 3. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hills, Kanavy, and Lin into Lloyd to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the

role table taught by Lin to implement the access authority for Lloyd so that the access authority could have been well organized and secure as taught by Lin in col. 7 lines 20-27.

10. Claims 5, 7, 12, 14, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lloyd, US 6,460,041 B2 priority filed 04/26/2000 in view of Hills et al. (hereinafter “Hills”), US 6,239,797 B1 filed 4/2/1998, Kanavy et al. (hereinafter “Kanavy”), US 5,544,298 patented 8/6/1996, and Lin et al. (hereinafter “Lin”), US 6,052,785 filed 11/21/1997 as applied to claims 4, 11, and 18 above, and further in view of Johnson et al. (hereinafter “Johnson”), US 6,023,683 patented 02/08/2000.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 12, and 19, Lloyd teaches using a web browser for accessing a database in fig. 6 and col. 2 line 62 – col. 3 line 5. Lloyd does not teach an electronic requisition catalog application implemented via a database table comprising a relational database for storing catalog data. Johnson does teach an electronic requisition catalog application implemented via a database table comprising a relational database for storing catalog data in fig. 1 and col. 3 lines 3-24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hills, Kanavy, Lin, and Johnson into Lloyd to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have implemented the requisition catalog application of Johnson within the web browser database access invention of Lloyd so that the user could have had easy access to the databases through the use of the web browser.

Regarding dependent claims 7, 14, and 20, Lloyd teaches varying access authority to the database to present text with hyperlinks to users authorized by the role table to edit the

selected fields and otherwise presenting straight text in col. 2 lines 45-55 and col. 8 lines 48-59, and col. 9 lines 35-64. Lloyd does not specifically teach the use of a role table providing indicia defining a role and access authority level of the web user identifier for a user operating the browser to access said code and data. Lin does teach the use of a role table providing indicia defining a role and access authority level of the web user identifier for a user operating the browser to access said code and data in fig. 3 and col. 7 lines 20-27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hills, Kanavy, Lin, and Johnson into Lloyd to have created the combined invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the role table taught by Lin to implement the access authority for Lloyd so that the access authority could have been well organized and secure as taught by Lin in col. 7 lines 20-27.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-12, and 14-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Examiner has introduced the prior art reference of Hills et al. to teach the added claim limitation of a temporary data frame used to dynamically populate data to a page display. The Examiner has introduced the prior art reference of Kanavy et al. to teach the added claim limitation of opening a new window which is used to operate an agent to collect data from the database.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nguyen et al., US 5,737,592 patented 4/7/1998 discloses accessing a relational database over the Internet using macro language files.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
11/20/2004



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER